

COUPLED FIXED POINT THEOREMS FOR CONTRACTION INVOLVING RATIONAL EXPRESSIONS IN PARTIALLY ORDERED METRIC SPACES

BESSEM SAMET AND HABIB YAZIDI

ABSTRACT. We establish coupled fixed point theorems for contraction involving rational expressions in partially ordered metric spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

A number of generalizations of the well-known Banach contraction theorem [2] were obtained in various directions. Most of these deal with the generalizations of the contractive condition (see [3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22] and others). Recently, Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [4], Nieto and Lopez [16, 17], Ran and Reurings [19] and Agarwal, El-Gebeily and O'Regan [1] presented some new results for contractions in partially ordered metric spaces.

In [4], Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham introduced the notion of a coupled fixed point and proved some coupled fixed point theorems for mappings satisfying a mixed monotone property. They discussed the problems of a uniqueness of a coupled fixed point and applied their theorems to problems of the existence and uniqueness of solution for a periodic boundary value problem. Lakshmikantham and Ćirić [13] introduced the concept of a mixed g-monotone mapping and proved coupled coincidence and coupled common fixed point theorems that extend theorems due to Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [4].

In this paper, we derive new coupled fixed point theorems in partially ordered metric space for mappings satisfying a mixed monotone property and a contractive condition involving rational expression. Our obtained results generalize theorems due to Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [4].

Before presenting the main results of the paper, we start by recalling some definitions introduced in [4].

Definition 1. Let $(X, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set and $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$. We say that F has the mixed monotone property if for any $x, y \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1, x_2 \in X, \quad x_1 \leq x_2 &\Rightarrow F(x_1, y) \leq F(x_2, y), \\ y_1, y_2 \in X, \quad y_1 \leq y_2 &\Rightarrow F(x, y_1) \geq F(x, y_2). \end{aligned}$$

This definition coincides with the notion of a mixed monotone function on $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $\leq$ represents the usual total order in $\mathbb{R}$.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54H25, 47H10, 34B15.

Key words and phrases. Coupled fixed point, partially ordered set, rational expression.

Definition 2. We call an element $(x, y) \in X \times X$ a coupled fixed point of the mapping $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ if

$$F(x, y) = x \quad \text{and} \quad F(y, x) = y.$$

Let $(X, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set. Further, we endow the product space $X \times X$ with the following partial order:

$$\text{for } (x, y), (u, v) \in X \times X, \quad (u, v) \leq (x, y) \Leftrightarrow x \geq u, \ y \leq v.$$

2. COUPLED FIXED POINT THEOREMS

2.1. Existence of a coupled fixed point. We start by the following result.

Theorem 1. Let $(X, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set and d be a metric on X such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Let $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ be a continuous mapping having the mixed monotone property on X . For all $(x, y), (u, v) \in X \times X$, we denote by $M((x, y), (u, v))$ the quantity:

$$\min \left\{ d(x, F(x, y)) \frac{2 + d(u, F(u, v)) + d(v, F(v, u))}{2 + d(x, u) + d(y, v)}, d(u, F(u, v)) \frac{2 + d(x, F(x, y)) + d(y, F(y, x))}{2 + d(x, u) + d(y, v)} \right\}.$$

Assume that there exists $\alpha, \beta > 0$ with $\alpha + \beta < 1$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad d(F(x, y), F(u, v)) \leq \alpha M((x, y), (u, v)) + \frac{\beta}{2} [d(x, u) + d(y, v)]$$

for all $(x, y), (u, v) \in X \times X$ with $x \geq u$ and $y \leq v$. We assume that there exists $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad x_0 \leq F(x_0, y_0) \quad \text{and} \quad y_0 \geq F(y_0, x_0).$$

Then, F has a coupled fixed point $(x, y) \in X \times X$.

Proof. Since $x_0 \leq F(x_0, y_0) = x_1$ (say) and $y_0 \geq F(y_0, x_0) = y_1$ (say), letting $x_2 = F(x_1, y_1)$ and $y_2 = F(y_1, x_1)$. We denote:

$$F^2(x_0, y_0) = F(F(x_0, y_0), F(y_0, x_0)) = F(x_1, y_1) = x_2$$

and

$$F^2(y_0, x_0) = F(F(y_0, x_0), F(x_0, y_0)) = F(y_1, x_1) = y_2.$$

Due to the mixed property of F , we have:

$$x_2 = F(x_1, y_1) \geq F(x_0, y_1) \geq F(x_0, y_0) = x_1$$

and

$$y_2 = F(y_1, x_1) \leq F(y_0, x_1) \leq F(y_0, x_0).$$

Further, for $n = 1, 2, \dots$, we let,

$$x_{n+1} = F^{n+1}(x_0, y_0) = F(F^n(x_0, y_0), F^n(y_0, x_0))$$

and

$$y_{n+1} = F^{n+1}(y_0, x_0) = F(F^n(y_0, x_0), F^n(x_0, y_0)).$$

We check easily that

$$x_0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_{n+1} \leq \dots$$

and

$$y_0 \geq y_1 \geq y_2 \geq \dots \geq y_{n+1} \geq \dots$$

Now, we claim that, for $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$(2.3) \quad d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \right)^n \frac{[d(x_1, x_0) + d(y_1, y_0)]}{2}$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad d(y_{n+1}, y_n) \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \right)^n \frac{[d(x_1, x_0) + d(y_1, y_0)]}{2}.$$

Indeed, for $n = 1$, using $x_1 \geq x_0$, $y_1 \leq y_0$ and (2.1), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_2, x_1) &= d(F(x_1, y_1), F(x_0, y_0)) \\ &\leq \alpha M((x_1, y_1), (x_0, y_0)) + \beta \frac{[d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)]}{2} \\ &\leq \alpha d(x_1, F(x_1, y_1)) \frac{2 + d(x_0, F(x_0, y_0)) + d(y_0, F(y_0, x_0))}{2 + d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)} \\ &\quad + \beta \frac{[d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)]}{2} \\ &= \alpha d(x_1, x_2) + \beta \frac{[d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)]}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$(1 - \alpha)d(x_2, x_1) \leq \beta \frac{[d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)]}{2},$$

i.e.,

$$d(x_2, x_1) \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \right) \frac{[d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)]}{2}.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} d(y_2, y_1) &= d(F(y_1, x_1), F(y_0, x_0)) \\ &= d(F(y_0, x_0), F(y_1, x_1)) \\ &\leq \alpha M((y_0, x_0), (y_1, x_1)) + \beta \frac{[d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)]}{2} \\ &\leq \alpha d(y_1, F(y_1, x_1)) \frac{2 + d(y_0, F(y_0, x_0)) + d(x_0, F(x_0, y_0))}{2 + d(y_0, y_1) + d(x_0, x_1)} \\ &\quad + \beta \frac{[d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)]}{2} \\ &= \alpha d(y_1, y_2) + \beta \frac{[d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)]}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$d(y_2, y_1) \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \right) \frac{[d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)]}{2}.$$

Now, assume that (2.3) and (2.4) hold. Using $x_{n+1} \geq x_n$ and $y_{n+1} \leq y_n$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
d(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) &= d(F(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}), F(x_n, y_n)) \\
&\leq \alpha M((x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}), (x_n, y_n)) + \beta \frac{[d(x_{n+1}, x_n) + d(y_{n+1}, y_n)]}{2} \\
&\leq \alpha d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) \frac{2 + d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(y_n, y_{n+1})}{2 + d(x_{n+1}, x_n) + d(y_{n+1}, y_n)} \\
&\quad + \beta \frac{[d(x_{n+1}, x_n) + d(y_{n+1}, y_n)]}{2} \\
&= \alpha d(x_{n+1}, x_{n+2}) + \beta \frac{[d(x_{n+1}, x_n) + d(y_{n+1}, y_n)]}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
d(x_{n+2}, x_{n+1}) &\leq \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \right) \frac{[d(x_{n+1}, x_n) + d(y_{n+1}, y_n)]}{2} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \right)^{n+1} \frac{[d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)]}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can show that

$$d(y_{n+2}, y_{n+1}) \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \right)^{n+1} \frac{[d(x_0, x_1) + d(y_0, y_1)]}{2}.$$

Since $0 < \frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} < 1$, (2.3) and (2.4) imply that $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ are Cauchy sequences in X .

Since (X, d) is a complete metric space, there exists $(x, y) \in X \times X$ such that

$$(2.5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} x_n = x \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} y_n = y.$$

Finally, we claim that (x, y) is a coupled fixed point of F . In fact, we have:

$$d(F(x, y), x) \leq d(F(x, y), x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, x) = d(F(x, y), F(x_n, y_n)) + d(x_{n+1}, x).$$

From (2.5) and the continuity of F , we get immediately that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(F(x, y), F(x_n, y_n)) + d(x_{n+1}, x) = 0.$$

Then, $F(x, y) = x$. Similarly,

$$d(F(y, x), y) \leq d(F(y, x), y_{n+1}) + d(y_{n+1}, y) = d(F(y, x), F(y_n, x_n)) + d(y_{n+1}, y)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} d(F(y, x), F(y_n, x_n)) + d(y_{n+1}, y) = 0,$$

which implies that $F(y, x) = y$. This makes end to the proof. $\square$

As in [4], Theorem 1 is also valid if we replace the continuity hypothesis of F by an additional property satisfied by the metric space X . This is the aim of the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let $(X, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set and d be a metric on X such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Assume that X has the following property:*

- (i) *if a nondecreasing sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X converges to $x \in X$, then $x_n \leq x$ for all n ,*

- (ii) if a nonincreasing sequence $\{y_n\}$ in X converges to $y \in X$, then $y_n \geq y$ for all n .

Let $F : X \times X \rightarrow X$ be a mapping having the mixed monotone property on X . Assume that there exists $\alpha, \beta > 0$ with $\alpha + \beta < 1$ such that

$$d(F(x, y), F(u, v)) \leq \alpha M((x, y), (u, v)) + \frac{\beta}{2}[d(x, u) + d(y, v)]$$

for all $(x, y), (u, v) \in X \times X$ with $x \geq u$ and $y \leq v$. We assume that there exists $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that

$$x_0 \leq F(x_0, y_0) \quad \text{and} \quad y_0 \geq F(y_0, x_0).$$

Then, F has a coupled fixed point $(x, y) \in X \times X$.

Proof. Following the proof of Theorem 1, we only have to show that (x, y) is a coupled fixed point of F . We have:

$$(2.6) \quad d(F(x, y), x) \leq d(F(x, y), x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, x) = d(F(x, y), F(x_n, y_n)) + d(x_{n+1}, x).$$

Since the nondecreasing sequence $\{x_n\}$ converges to x and the nonincreasing sequence $\{y_n\}$ converges to y , by (i)-(ii), we have:

$$x \geq x_n \quad \text{and} \quad y \leq y_n, \quad \forall n.$$

Now, from the contraction condition, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d(F(x, y), F(x_n, y_n)) &\leq \alpha M((x, y), (x_n, y_n)) + \frac{\beta}{2}[d(x, x_n) + d(y, y_n)] \\ &\leq \alpha d(x, F(x, y)) \frac{2 + d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(y_n, y_{n+1})}{2 + d(x, x_n) + d(y, y_n)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta}{2}[d(x, x_n) + d(y, y_n)]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, from (2.6), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} d(F(x, y), x) &\leq \alpha d(x, F(x, y)) \frac{2 + d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(y_n, y_{n+1})}{2 + d(x, x_n) + d(y, y_n)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta}{2}[d(x, x_n) + d(y, y_n)] + d(x_{n+1}, x) \\ &\rightarrow \alpha d(x, F(x, y)) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$(1 - \alpha)d(F(x, y), x) \leq 0.$$

Since $0 < \alpha < 1$, we obtain $d(F(x, y), x) = 0$, i.e., $F(x, y) = x$.

Similarly,

$$(2.7) \quad d(F(y, x), y) \leq d(F(y, x), y_{n+1}) + d(y_{n+1}, y) = d(F(y_n, x_n), F(y, x)) + d(y_{n+1}, y).$$

From the contraction condition, we get:

$$d(F(y_n, x_n), F(y, x)) \leq \alpha d(y, F(y, x)) \frac{2 + d(y_n, y_{n+1}) + d(x_n, x_{n+1})}{2 + d(y_n, y) + d(x_n, x)} + \frac{\beta}{2}[d(y_n, y) + d(x_n, x)].$$

Then, from (2.7), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} d(F(y, x), y) &\leq \alpha d(y, F(y, x)) \frac{2 + d(y_n, y_{n+1}) + d(x_n, x_{n+1})}{2 + d(y_n, y) + d(x_n, x)} + \frac{\beta}{2} [d(y_n, y) + d(x_n, x)] \\ &\quad + d(y_{n+1}, y) \\ &\rightarrow \alpha d(y, F(y, x)) \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$(1 - \alpha)d(F(y, x), y) \leq 0.$$

Hence, $d(F(y, x), y) = 0$, i.e., $F(y, x) = y$. This makes end to the proof. $\square$

2.2. Uniqueness of the coupled fixed point.

Theorem 3. *Assume that*

(2.8)

$\forall (x, y), (x^*, y^*) \in X \times X, \exists (z_1, z_2) \in X \times X$ *that is comparable to* (x, y) *and* (x^*, y^*) .

Adding (2.8) to the hypotheses of Theorem 1, we obtain the uniqueness of the coupled fixed point of F .

Proof. Suppose that (x^*, y^*) is another coupled fixed point of F , i.e.,

$$F(x^*, y^*) = x^* \quad \text{and} \quad F(y^*, x^*) = y^*.$$

Let us prove that

$$(2.9) \quad d(x, x^*) + d(y, y^*) = 0,$$

where

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} F^n(x_0, y_0) = x \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} F^n(y_0, x_0) = y.$$

As in [4], we distinguish two cases.

First case: (x, y) is comparable to (x^*, y^*) with respect the ordering in $X \times X$. In this case, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(F^n(x, y), F^n(y, x)) = (x, y) \text{ is comparable to } (F^n(x^*, y^*), F^n(y^*, x^*)) = (x^*, y^*).$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, x^*) + d(y, y^*) &= d(F^n(x, y), F^n(x^*, y^*)) + d(F^n(y, x), F^n(y^*, x^*)) \\ &\leq \beta^n [d(x, x^*) + d(y, y^*)]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < \beta < 1$, (2.9) holds.

Second case: (x, y) is not comparable to (x^*, y^*) .

In this case, there exists $(z_1, z_2) \in X \times X$ that is comparable to (x, y) and (x^*, y^*) . Then, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(F^n(z_1, z_2), F^n(z_2, z_1))$ is comparable to $(F^n(x, y), F^n(y, x)) = (x, y)$ and $(F^n(x^*, y^*), F^n(y^*, x^*)) = (x^*, y^*)$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, x^*) + d(y, y^*) &= d(F^n(x, y), F^n(x^*, y^*)) + d(F^n(y, x), F^n(y^*, x^*)) \\ &\leq d(F^n(x, y), F^n(z_1, z_2)) + d(F^n(z_1, z_2), F^n(x^*, y^*)) \\ &\quad + d(F^n(y, x), F^n(z_2, z_1)) + d(F^n(z_2, z_1), F^n(y^*, x^*)) \\ &\leq \beta^n [d(x, z_1) + d(y, z_2) + d(x^*, z_1) + d(y^*, z_2)]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < \beta < 1$, we have:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \beta^n [d(x, z_1) + d(y, z_2) + d(x^*, z_1) + d(y^*, z_2)] = 0,$$

which implies that (2.9) holds.

We deduce that in all cases (2.9) holds. This implies that $(x, y) = (x^*, y^*)$ and the uniqueness of the coupled fixed point of F is proved. $\square$

2.3. Equality between the components of the coupled fixed point. If x_0, y_0 in X are comparable, we have the following result.

Theorem 4. *In addition to the hypotheses of Theorem 1 (resp. Theorem 2), suppose that x_0, y_0 in X are comparable. Then $x = y$.*

Proof. Suppose that $x_0 \leq y_0$. We claim that

$$(2.10) \quad x_n \leq y_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

From the mixed monotone property of F , we have:

$$x_1 = F(x_0, y_0) \leq F(y_0, y_0) \leq F(y_0, x_0) = y_1.$$

Assume that $x_n \leq y_n$ for some n . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n+1} &= F^{n+1}(x_0, y_0) \\ &= F(F^n(x_0, y_0), F^n(y_0, x_0)) \\ &= F(x_n, y_n) \\ &\leq F(y_n, y_n) \\ &\leq F(y_n, x_n) = y_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (2.10) holds.

Now, using (2.10) and the contraction condition, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, y) &\leq d(x, x_{n+1}) + d(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}) + d(y_{n+1}, y) \\ &= d(x, x_{n+1}) + d(F(F^n(x_0, y_0), F^n(y_0, x_0)), F(F^n(y_0, x_0), F^n(x_0, y_0))) + d(y_{n+1}, y) \\ &= d(x, x_{n+1}) + d(F(y_n, x_n), F(x_n, y_n)) + d(y_{n+1}, y) \\ &\leq d(x, x_{n+1}) + \alpha M((y_n, x_n), (x_n, y_n)) + \beta d(x_n, y_n) + d(y_{n+1}, y) \\ &\leq d(x, x_{n+1}) + \alpha d(y_n, y_{n+1}) \frac{2 + d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(y_n, y_{n+1})}{2 + 2d(y_n, x_n)} \\ &\quad + \beta d(x_n, y_n) + d(y_{n+1}, y) \\ &\leq d(x, x_{n+1}) + \alpha d(y_n, y_{n+1}) \frac{2 + d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(y_n, y_{n+1})}{2} \\ &\quad + \beta [d(x_n, x) + d(y, y_n)] + d(y_{n+1}, y) + \beta d(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \beta)d(x, y) &\leq d(x, x_{n+1}) + \alpha d(y_n, y_{n+1}) \frac{2 + d(x_n, x_{n+1}) + d(y_n, y_{n+1})}{2} \\ &\quad + \beta [d(x_n, x) + d(y, y_n)] + d(y_{n+1}, y) \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < \beta < 1$, this implies that $d(x, y) = 0$, i.e., $x = y$. This makes end to the proof. $\square$

2.4. Remark. If we put:

$$f(x) = F(x, x), \quad \forall x \in X,$$

for $x = y = \hat{x}$ and $u = v = \hat{y}$, the contraction (2.1) implies:

$$d(f(\hat{x}), f(\hat{y})) \leq \alpha d(\hat{y}, f(\hat{y})) \frac{1 + d(\hat{x}, f(\hat{x}))}{1 + d(\hat{x}, \hat{y})} + \beta d(\hat{x}, \hat{y}),$$

and we retrieve the contraction of Dass and Gupta [5].

REFERENCES

- [1] R. P. Agarwal, M.A. El-Gebeily and D. O'Regan, *Generalized contractions in partially ordered metric spaces*, Appl. Anal. 87 (2008) 1-8.
- [2] S.Banach, *Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraites et leurs applications*, Fund. Math. 3 (1922) 133-181.
- [3] I. Beg and M. Abbas, *Coincidence point and invariant approximation for mappings satisfying generalized weak contractive condition*, Fixed Point Theory Appl. 2006(2006), article ID 74503, 1-7.
- [4] T. G. Bhaskar and V. Lakshmikantham, *Fixed point theorems in partially ordered metric spaces and applications*, Nonlinear Anal. 65 (2006) 1379-1393.
- [5] B. K. Dass and S. Gupta, *An extension of Banach contraction principle through rational expression*, Indian J. pure appl. Math. 6 (1975) 1455-1458.
- [6] K. Deimling, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Springer Verlag, 1985.
- [7] G.E. Hardy and T.D. Rogers, *A generalization of a fixed point theorem of Reich*, Canad. Math. Bull. 16 (1973) 201-206.
- [8] G. Jungck, *Commuting maps and fixed points*, Amer. Math. Monthly. 83 (1976) 261-263.
- [9] G. Jungck, *Compatible mappings and common fixed points*, Internat. J. Math. Math. Sci.9 (1986) 771-779.
- [10] G. Jungck, *Common fixed points for commuting and compatible maps on compacta*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 103 (1988) 977-983.
- [11] G. Jungck, *Common fixed points for noncontinuous nonself maps on non-metric spaces*, Far East J. Math. Sci. 4 (1996) 199-215.
- [12] G. Jungck and B.E. Rhoades, *Fixed points for set valued functions without continuity*, Indian J. pure appl. Math. 29 (1998) 227-238.
- [13] V. Lakshmikanthama and Lj. B. Ćirić, *Coupled fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions in partially ordered metric spaces*, Nonlinear Analysis. 70 (2009) 4341-4349.
- [14] J. Matkowski, *Integrable solutions of functional equations*, Diss. Math. 127 (1975) Warsaw.
- [15] A. Meir and E. Keeler, *A theorem on contraction mappings*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 28 (1969) 326-329.
- [16] J.J. Nieto and R. R. Lopez, *Contractive mapping theorems in partially ordered sets and applications to ordinary differential equations*, Order 22 (2005) 223-239.
- [17] J.J. Nieto and R.R. Lopez, *Existence and uniqueness of fixed point in partially ordered sets and applications to ordinary differential equations*, Acta Math. Sinica, Engl. Ser. 23 (12) (2007) 2205-2212.
- [18] R.P. Pant, *Common fixed points of noncommuting mappings*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 188 (1994) 436-440.
- [19] A.C.M. Ran and M.C.B. Reurings, *A fixed point theorem in partially ordered sets and some applications to matrix equations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 132 (2004) 1435-1443.
- [20] S. Reich, *Some remarks concerning contraction mappings*, Canad. Math. Bull. 14 (1971) 121-124.
- [21] B.E. Rhoads, *A comparison of various definitions of contractive mappings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 26 (1977) 257-290.
- [22] S. Sessa, *On a weak commutativity condition of mappings in fixed point considerations*, Publ. Inst. Math. 32 (1982) 149-153.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TUNIS COLLEGE OF SCIENCES AND TECHNIQUES, 5 AVENUE TAHA HUSSEIN, BP, 59, BAB MANARA, TUNIS.

E-mail address: `bessem.samet@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TUNIS COLLEGE OF SCIENCES AND TECHNIQUES, 5 AVENUE TAHA HUSSEIN, BP, 59, BAB MANARA, TUNIS.

E-mail address: `Habib.Yazidi@esstt.rnu.tn`